

## PSEUDO STATUTORY ACT – DESTRUCTIVE INTERFERENCE

The purpose of this quasi-act is to have a document that explains what “Destructive Interference” (D.I.) is. This goal of this document is to indicate the nature if D.I. to demonstrate that it has all the hallmarks and elements of behaviour, efforts, and acts that are already prohibited and deemed unlawful and criminal.

D.I. is entirely unique in its potential for complete disregard and vestment of judgement if the/a affected and effected recipient person does not declare themselves to be adversely impacted resulting in loss, cost, damage or diminishment. Alternatively stated, there is potentially no offence without a self-declared victim.

This is not an attempt at a formal ‘legislative act’, though it is intended to attempt to have some similarities. In accord with the approximation that this document represents, it is noteworthy that judicial interpretation of this work should be application of the Golden Rule, necessary because of the limited knowledge of the science failing the descriptions herein.

It also attempts to convey some notion of a requirement for suitable remedies, to show that anyone subject to acts of D.I. will inevitably suffer, and as a direct consequence of the act they became subject to, they will incur the same costs, impairment, losses and damage as those normally associated with expressly criminal acts.

This document is intended to symbolically combat and provide remedy for the wilful decisions (actus reus) imposed involuntarily upon any reasonable person without their consent, and without them having any awareness that they have been relegated the status of a victim, and the results of such are about to be realised, sensed or measured.

The core purpose of this act is no to emulate a proper legislative act, but to indicate the nature of un-natural acts of destructive interference. This document is not intended to promote legislation, or retrospective claims, but to point out that there are opportunities for Destructive Interference to be Constructive Interference.

### DEFINITIONS FOR Destructive Interference (D.I.)

- i) “Destructive Interference” (D.I.) is comprised of the following elements:
  - a. the wilful intentional introduction of sensory stimuli of any amplitude,
  - b. The Actus Reus : a change in any stasis, organ or system or part of anatomy or mind
    - i. that is prevented from functioning in a regular manner, or as it was before the interference
    - ii. resulting from a wilful act, planned or unplanned
    - iii. associated with mens rea.
  - c) the imposition of a ‘signal’ that causes or determines change could at any point be ascribed to be the purposeful act of individual person who
    - a. had knowledge of the fact that their behaviour would result in the imposition and
    - b. results in the application of an imposition that leads to a change in stasis, function or normal state
  - ci) imposed involuntarily upon any a person
    - a. without their consent,
    - b. without them necessarily having any awareness that they have been relegated the status of a victim
    - c. whether or not they have been told that they are being or about to be interfered with
  - cii) The feature of non-verbal communication, being a physical imposition or gesture lacking proximity, a non-contact gesture, (seemingly passively), affronting without observable movement, that is unavoidable by the recipient who has ‘normal’ mobility and is unrestrained
- ii) D.I does not include
  - a. (Telepathic) verbal communication being language based communication. The use of words propagated by any means is held to be separate and differentiated from an ‘telekinetic’ act of D.I.
- iii) The Undertaking or Commissioning of an act of D.I.
  - a. If there is engagement of an individual for the purpose of that individual performing an act of D.I against another person without the subject’s request or consent, then the performer and the commissioner are jointly and severally liable.
  - b. It may occur that the capability and capacity for an act of D.I. is unavailable to most, and the propensity of only a few individuals. Any arrangement or agreement that exists between individuals for the purpose of an act

of D.I. apportions joint and several liability as a prohibited act if there is an action that meets the other definitions that determine it to be D.I.

- iv) "Person" includes
  - a. individual or 'entity' capable of performing and act of D.I., or receiving D.I.
  - b. an individual or 'entity' capable of informed or uninformed consent
  - c. an individual or 'entity' possessing language skills for communication
  - d. is naturally comprised or capable of in some proportion autonomy, sentience and volition
  - e. an individual or 'entity' capable of accepting rights afforded at law and available to any entities or individuals in proximity
- v) "Zoning", "Zoned" (colloquial) is :
  - a. The (adjective / noun/ verb) that describes the receipt of an act of destructive interference

#### Actionable Measures & Actionable Acts

- i) Actionable measures and actionable acts are two necessary mandatory pre-requisites that must be achieved in order to arrive at a determination of the wilful effort eliciting an undertaking of D.I.. Once present, an event can be deemed a transgression or not, by some behaviour can be said to have taken place, or actually occurred, with respect to (wilful application of) D.I., as per the definitions *supra*.
- ii) a) Actionable measures should be characterised and defined by their propensity for substantiation. Insofar as actionable measures must be present to constitute an actionable act, they are the measurable effect, or an observable effect, that indicates that some wilful decision resulted in behaviour eliciting an allegation of D.I..  
b) There is no concept of circumstantial factors or indication through externalities such as proximity or influence.
- c) An actionable measure is evidence of an effect, regardless of its transience or temporality, that can be and is outlined in part (i) of the s. DEFINITIONS FOR D.I. *infra*.
- ii) a) An actionable act(s) is the wilful act or omission, or commissioning of something that constitutes the wilful act or omission, that precipitates an actionable measure(s). Actionable measures have two dispensable antecedent components (s. part (i) herein), that must be met to determine the applicability of an event. An actionable measure is defined in part by the necessitation of the components of Actus Reus and Mens Rea. Determination of an event or effort to be an actionable act therefore effectively requires the satisfaction of four principles, two indicating an actionable measure, which further requires by definition two more.  
b) An actionable act must also include and comprise the elements set out in parts (ii) and (iii) of the s. DEFINITIONS FOR D.I. *infra*.

#### DESTRUCTIVE INTERFERENCE CONVICTION COMMENTARY

- 1) If an undertaking was to be assessed for its binomial success or failure with regards to perpetrating D.I., then the method of accomplishing this is to meet the requirement of the presence of an actionable measure and an actionable act.
- 2) Notwithstanding point (1) sup., such an effort or behaviour might not be considered a perpetration if there is no person complaining of disenfranchisement or seeking availability of recourse for an alleged effort of D.I..

#### An Example Of An Effort Of D.I. That Is Not Actionable (includes the enlistment of volunteer schizophrenics / victims):

- i) The basis for an alternative to 'criminal' Destructive Interference could be characterised by
  - a. A capacity for consent
  - b. A capacity for informed consent
  - c. An opportunity for consent
  - d. An offer for consent
  - e. A contract of consent that includes duration and levels / extent of interference permissible
- vi) An understanding of how to acquire an outcome or a result from the conflict agreed to

#### A MODEL SHOWING THE SERIOUSNESS OF D.I. MEASURED DIFFERENTLY TO NORMAL CRIMINAL LAW

#### Normal criminal law

#### Destructive Interference

